RESTORATION REVIEW

THE HUMAN PREDICAMENT

Ours is an age of anxiety. Man can manuever his way to the moon, but cannot learn to negotiate a life. He is overwhelmed by problems that defy solution.

His only answer lies in strength beyond his own resources.

See THE STRENGTH OF CHRIST
Page 42

THE THOUGHT GAP:
A HUMAN LIMITATION
Page 49

Volume 11, No. 3 **March, 1969**

Volume 11, No. 3 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **March 1969**

A Scriptural Call for Renewal . . .

THE STRENGTH OF CHRIST

I can cope with everything by him who strengthens me.—Phil. 4:13

We all have those passages of scripture that bring to mind experiences of yesteryear. Nearly always when I hear or read this great passage from Paul's letter to the Philippians I think of a perilous operation my Mother had many years ago.

I whispered these words of comfort into her ear as she was wheeled away to surgery: *I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.* She told me later that she repeated those words over and over to herself until denied by the anesthesia. Bless her dear heart, that operation was supposed to kill her, and we feared we would lose her, but she lived on another 15 years!

Above I have used the rendition by Schonfield, for it is more expressive than the traditional translations. *I can cope with everything by him who strengthens me.* That speaks with such meaning to our complex way of life. Life can be so difficult that we do well if we can just cope with it, not to speak of conquering it. The truth is, however, that man cannot struggle with life's vicissitudes with any satisfaction without resources of power beyond himself. This is what it means to be a Christian. Christ is our strength! He is strong in us even when we are weak. Indeed, it is in our weakness that He is made strong In us.

If we would only believe that Christ is relevant to the demands that today's world places upon us! Believing would make it so. As Augustine put it: "I believe, therefore I know."

Does Christ give the business man the strength to cope with his many problems? Is the strength of Christ relevant to today's riots and lawlessness? Does He empower the believing statesman in reference to the complex international problems that plague the world? Is Christ indeed the answer to poverty, ignorance, war, famine, overpopulation, and disease? Can a mayor look to Christ for the strength to cope with urban problems that appear to be almost impossible of solution? We are all pressed with the stress and strain of making ends meet, of getting along with each other, of rearing children who sometimes drive us to distraction, of staying well, of getting an education. Docs Christ *really* make a difference in these matters?

The predicament of being human was evident once more in the story of Mickey Mantle's retirement from baseball. He told the reporters: "I can't play anymore. I don't hit the ball when I need to. I can't steal when I need to. I can't score from second when I need to." Ah, but that story has been told many a time, whether it be a banker, baker, or candle-stick-maker.

But it seemed unreal for Mickey Mantle to be talking that way. I recall seeing Mickey play the Red Sox when I was in graduate school at Harvard. I was sitting in the bleachers for the sun as well as for economic reasons, and when Mickey came to bat for the third time without a hit, I had the feeling that he would put this one right in my lap. And sure enough he did! At least it hit barely in front of me, striking the rail and bouncing back into the field of play. By the time Jim Piersal had fielded it Mickey was at third. The umpire ruled that the ball was always in play, but Casey Stengel growled that it was a home run. To this day I can see Mantle sitting on third base while the argument went on and on. The reporters from the Boston papers interviewed me and those around me to get our verdict.

I recall asking the reporter if it were all that important, that Mantle had a triple anyway and went on to score. The reporter retorted that “The season is young, and suppose Mantle hits 59 homers this year, and is denied this one?” Well, he was denied that one, and the umpire was right, and Mantle did hit over 50 homers that year. Mickey’s coaches believe that he could have hit 75 homers a year had it not been for his injured knee.

But now Mickey hangs them up. No more home-runs, no more baseball. It hardly seems right. For him to say, “I can’t hit the ball anymore,” has a sadness about it, something like a bird not being able to fly anymore. It is as unreal as the prospect of our losing Dwight Eisenhower. Mickey has to hang them up and play no more baseball and the animated Eisenhower has to die. That’s the world for you!

How docs the strength of Christ relate to all this? It docs not mean that Christ’s strength will enable a Mantle to play baseball forever, nor does it spare us the frailty of old age and death, not even for an Eisenhower.

It does mean, however, that whatever the experience may be one can look for the will of God and trust in the strength of Christ to do that will. In Christ a man can find peace even in hanging up the gear that has brought him fame, for the next stage of life can be equally meaningful if it be a life in Christ. An Eisenhower can look back with nostalgia at his great military and political victories, but one can believe that the victory of all victories comes to him in following Christ on into death and eternity.

Paul believed that Christ answers every need. He said as much to the same Philippians: “My God in turn will supply every need of yours in Christ Jesus by his wealth in glory.” The trouble with us is that we confuse what we *want* with what God knows we *need.* Our *need* is to be conformed to God’s image through Christ. All life should move in this direction. To make another million, to live another decade, to hit another 100 homers may not do this. It may come through very difficult circumstances, even by being unloved and misunderstood. Or even by endless illness. Christ’s strength shines through our frailties.

Paul explains this to the Philippians: "The very things that were an asset to me, these I regarded as a dead loss on Christ's account. Indeed, I definitely regard everything as a dead loss because of the excellence of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Master, for whom all is well lost, and I regard it as so much rubbish, that I may gain Christ."—*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

"Declaration and Address": Mandate for Renewal . . .

THE SPIRIT OF THE "DECLARATION AND ADDRESS"

Before we move into a consideration of Thomas Campbell's lengthy *Declaration and Address,* in which he sets forth the principles that gave rise to the Restoration Movement, it is appropriate that we observe the spirit in which the document was written. We have reference to the attitude that Mr. Campbell had toward the problems that faced the church of his day, which are similar to those that we confront, and the attitude he showed toward others, especially those who differed with him.

The disposition that created the document is especially evident in the appendix to the document. The appendix itself is 60 pages, longer than the document proper. It is here that we can see Campbell coming to terms with some of the questions growing out of his mandate for renewal, the *Declaration and Address.* Principles can be obscure and impractical even when valid. They need illustration and explanation, and they especially need to be related to the problems faced by those at the grass roots level. In the appendix Campbell does this, reflecting the spirit that was to characterize the earlier stages of our Movement. This is why the appendix should have been the introduction and placed at the beginning rather than at the end.

Other Churches

At the very outset Mr. Campbell expressed concern that the Movement he had begun among the churches might be misunderstood. He made it clear that his purpose was to restore peace and unity, not to attack and destroy the existing churches. "We beg leave to assure our brethren," he wrote, "that we have no intention to interfere, either directly or indirectly, with the peace and order of the settled Churches."

He further made it clear that he had no intention of causing people to leave the established churches to join his Movement. Even though the ministers may teach things with which he disagreed, he observed, this would not cause him to discourage people from hearing them. He wanted it to be said of his efforts "They seek not *yours* but *you,*" and so

long as this spirit prevailed the existing churches would have nothing to fear from his labor of love.

While this intention on Campbell's part was a noble one, it was hardly realistic. He had himself left the Presbyterians after some stormy experiences, and those who helped him start the Christian Association of Washington had also deserted their churches. Theoretically, the pioneers could have worked for unity and restoration *within* the churches, flatly refusing to start any other religious community; but practically this was hardly possible. Certainly they were not likely to influence others to stay with the churches and work for restoration within the traditional structures when they themselves had not done this.

In only a few years tens of thousands had joined the Campbells, with most of them coming from the established churches. It is academic to linger with the question of whether it could have been otherwise. What is important here is that the Campbells—did have an irenic spirit toward the churches. They would have preferred to restore to the existing churches their view of the ancient order of things rather than starting afresh, but this could hardly be, especially since the clergy reacted so negatively to their effort.

Creeds

It may surprise some of us, in view of our opposition to creeds through the years, that Mr. Campbell did not object to a creed *per se.* If a creed is no more than a statement of faith, a confession of one's belief, or a defense of his doctrine, there can be no objection. It is when the creed is used as a means of judging others or as a test of fellowship that it is evil in Campbell's view. It is the *abuse* of the creed that he opposed. Creeds are used to form new parties, he pointed out, and to divide the church.

Campbell believed that the basic fallacy of a creed, especially when used as a test of fellowship, is that it assumes that all God's children are of the same mentality and at the same level of understanding in regard to doctrines difficult to interpret. It is a serious sin, he believed, to bar people from the Christian community because they cannot accept what is beyond their apprehension. A "very high degree of doctrinal information" and "very clear and decisive judgment" were required to satisfy the demands of the creeds, he observed.

This is where they are wrong, he insisted, in that they draw the line of fellowship when the Bible does not. If a creed would not do this and was but a statement of "the great system of Divine truths and defensive testimonies in opposition to prevailing errors," he would have no objection. In fact he would see this as beneficial.

Opinions

From the very outset of the Restoration Movement in this country it was the problem of opinions that demanded so much attention, and it still appears to be a stumblingblock in our own efforts to complete the work of the pioneers. Mr. Campbell wrote more about this question in the *Declaration and Address* than any other.

But the thesis was clearly stated from the beginning: *private opinions are not to be made the basis of Christian communion.* It was readily conceded that there would be differences of opinion in interpreting the scriptures, and this would not be discouraged. Opinions were private property, and a man was entitled to as many as he desired. Bur he was not to make his opinion a test of fellowship or make his own interpretations a means of judging others.

As Mr. Campbell put it: “We dare not, therefore, patronize the rejection of God’s dear children, because they may not be able to see alike in matters of human inference of private opinion.”

He included himself in this judgment of opinion: “Thus we conclude to make no conclusion of our own, nor of any other fallible fellow creature, a rule of faith or duty to our brother.”

The spirit of the Movement, according to Campbell, was to be friendly persuasion. He would plead for unity among the churches; he would call for a restoration of the primitive faith; but he would not presume to dictate to the churches what they should do.

“We have only proposed what appeared to *us* most likely to promote the desired event,” he explained, “humbly submitting the whole premises to their candid and impartial investigation, to be altered, corrected, and amended, as they see cause, or to adopt any other plan that may appear more just and unexceptionable.”

This is the language of a man of peace, a conciliatory soul who wants to lead, not drive. We can only regret that this humble approach to religious problems, one that is as eager to learn from others as it is to teach, has not been more characteristic of our Movement.

He sought to correct what he called “a great evil” in reference to human opinion, namely, “the judging and rejecting of each other in matters wherein the Lord hath not judged.” It is in this context that he sets forth a principle that is most relevant to our time, a time when the church is fractured by the futile habit of making human opinions into divine law. Here is the statement that should appear repeatedly in all our brotherhood journals.

No man has a right to judge his brother except insofar as he manifestly violates the express letter of the law.

Campbell drives home this point, insisting that we have no right to take offense at a brother's opinions so long as he holds them as such. If he does usurp the place of the lawgiver and makes his opinions into laws for others, we judge him even then, not for his opinions, but for his presumption.

He was convinced that troubles in the church have arisen over paying attention to opinions that should have been ignored. "The constant insisting upon them, as articles of faith and terms of salvation, have so beaten them into the minds of men, that, in many instances, they would as soon deny the Bible itself as give up one of those opinions."

Somehow the heirs of the Restoration Movement failed to learn this lesson, our many divisions serving as monuments to that failure. That men will and should have opinions is evident enough, but that they would impose these upon others as matters of faith, thus rending asunder both homes and churches and causing untold misery, is surely one of the great wrongs of our time.

But a roll call of those opinions—instrumental music, the manner of serving the Supper, millennial theories, missionary methods, cooperative programs, to name only a few—bear witness to Campbell's wisdom. We divide and subdivide, all over opinions. If they could have been ignored and not insisted upon either way, *for* them or *against* them, we might now be a united people. Premillennialism is an illustration of what so often happens. If those who believed it had set it forth as their own interpretation, which for the most part was the case, and if the others of us had allowed them to hold such opinions without reprisal, it would never have divided us. But somebody had to make a big deal out of *opposing* it, insisting that his opinions to the contrary be the accepted norm. It was a case of negative lawmaking. You *cannot* be a premillennialist and be within the fellowship!

Nature of Unity

Campbell made it clear that he had no illusions about everybody seeing the Bible alike. He described it as "morally impossible" that men should have identical views about divinely revealed truths. The oneness he pled for, he insisted, was not a "unity of sentiment", but a oneness with a diversity of opinion that calls for mutual sympathy and forbearance. He observes that uniformity of doctrine, in those instances where it has been achieved for a time, has made no lasting contribution to unity. Even creeds, designed to achieve uniformity, have done nothing for the unity of Christians.

In response to the criticism that his position is too liberal or latitudinarian, Mr. Campbell acknowledge that it is surely God's intention that His people be of one heart and one mind and that there be substantial unity of sentiment. But it is unrealistic to expect perfection along these lines, for there will always be errors in the church. As he puts it: "We only take it for granted that such a state of perfection is neither intended nor

attainable in this world, as will free the Church from all those weaknesses, mistakes, and mismanagements from which she will be completely exempted in heaven."

He places the question of unity directly before his readers: *"What shall we do, then, to heal our divisions?"*

To continue in the present practice is to perpetuate the divisions forever. His answer to the question is what our people have long proclaimed to the religious world: "Profess, inculcate, and practice neither more nor less, neither anything else nor otherwise than the Divine word expressly declares respecting the entire subject of faith and duty, and simply to rest in *that,* as the expression of our faith and rule of our practice."

If the churches will but have a "Thus saith the Lord" for all they believe and practice, he avowed, then unity can be a reality. This is being neither broad nor narrow, but only doing as the Lord subscribes. To walk by any other rule is to accept *human* authority, which is the cause of all the divisions.

This is language with which most of us are familiar. The message is clear and unmistakable. If men will simply take the Bible, nothing more nor less, and be directed by what it expressly enjoins, and only that, we can heal our divisions.

Over a century and a half has passed since Mr. Campbell set forth these ideas, and while a great and noble people has arisen from his labors, the annoying fact remains that even his own followers are divided into a score of factions. His answer to the problem of division has solved nothing—neither in Christendom at large or in his own Movement.

Mr. Campbell's answer is too simple or it is simply wrong. He says, for instance: "They will all profess and practice the same thing, for *the Bible exhibits but one and the self same thing to all."* How can we say this in the light of centuries of history? The simple truth is that good, honest, sincere men see the Bible differently, with or without creeds.

Yet the embryo for a workable solution is present in the *Declaration and Address,* and it was left for Mr. Campbell's son, Alexander Campbell, to set forth a more workable solution. Mr. Campbell recognized that men are at different stages of maturity, that they are constitutionally different, and that it is "morally impossible" for them to see everything alike. Yet he supposed that men *can* see alike what the Bible *expressly* says. That is, the *facts* can be understood by all alike. But this too has its difficulty, for just how are the facts to be separated from the rest?

Gospel and Doctrine

Mr. Campbell needed to be aware of a distinction that was finally discovered by his son. If he had said that *the gospel of Christ,* as revealed in the Bible, can be believed and obeyed by all, leaving room for varieties of opinions and interpretations in regard to *the doctrine of the apostles,* his position would have been less vulnerable.

There is no cause for opinion or differences respecting *the fact of Christ.* The gospel is a proclamation of good news that one accepts or rejects. It was "the thing preached" long before there were any New Testament scriptures. This led Alexander Campbell to refer to a belief in the one *fact* (Christ is Lord) and a submission to the one *act* (baptism) as the basis of unity. His father was struggling for such clarity, but lacked insight into the difference between *gospel* and *doctrine.*

Never in this world will men be able to see alike all that is in the New Testament scriptures, nor is there any evidence that such was ever intended by God. Men were one in Christ, they were united and enjoying fellowship with the Spirit, well before the New Testament scriptures were composed. This being true, those scriptures cannot be the basis for unity. It is the Christ revealed in those scriptures that is the basis of unity. When men believe in Him and obey Him in baptism they are one.

This is to say that the gospel is *not* the whole of the New Testament scriptures, for the gospel was a reality long before the scriptures were written. Strictly speaking, the teachings of the apostles are not *facts,* as the gospel is, but interpretations, implications, and edification based on the gospel. In this area, that of the *didache* (teaching) even the apostles differed in their ideas and emphases. The churches for whom these documents were written were likewise different from each other.

In all such areas as the worship of the corporate body, the organization of the congregation, personal and congregational problems there is room for different interpretations, which are evident in the scriptures themselves. Paul and Peter were as different as Jerusalem and Antioch. But whether Paul or Peter, Jerusalem or Antioch, there was unity, for they were all one in Christ. The gospel made them one. The *doctrine,* which was still being created, was and always will be subject to differences.

The *doctrine* allows for debate and dialogue, for intellectual stimulation and the stretching of the mind. It nurtures us in Christ, but in such a way that each man develops according to his own uniqueness. The pragmatic mind as well as the speculative mind finds food for thought. Its design is not to make us all alike in our thinking, but to make us mature in Christ. The gospel is not of this nature, for it is the glorious revelation of heaven in the form of a Person that has inducted us into fellowship with God and with each other. Growth follows this induction, its source being the apostles' teaching.

Differences regarding doctrine may at times place a strain upon fellowship, but it is a tragic error to suppose that unanimity of doctrine is the basis of fellowship. If we wait for all of us to see all the scriptures alike before we are united, we will still be divided when the Lord comes.

Thomas Campbell's *Declaration and Address* sets the tone for sensible dialogue, and, as we shall see in further installments, it postulates principles that are relevant to our day. In this installment we have seen his sincere struggle for answers to almost impossible

problems, his attitude toward creeds and opinions, as well as his treatment of those whose ideas he opposed.

All this we find not only exemplary, but worthy of building upon. After 160 years we should be well in advance of the point reached by Thomas Campbell. That we instead find ourselves yet behind is a serious indictment against our own sectarianism.—*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

THE THOUGHT GAP: A HUMAN LIMITATION

CLOYD ANTHONY

Contemporary communications media have been repleted with discussions of gaps: "security gap", "credibility gap", "communication gap", and others. It occurs to me that the gap in our thinking processes may be basic to all other gaps, and to our personal and social problems. This gap is difficult to identify in ourselves, and more difficult still to bridge. It seems to be indigenous to human fallibility, to our culture and our total way of life.

This little article is intended to focus attention primarily on the thought gap in the religious world, and more specifically in our brotherhood—that wing of the Restoration Movement called the Church of Christ. (Or, if you prefer, the church of Christ.) I was "born and reared" in this brotherhood and I shall never, of my own accord, defect. Serious as our shortcomings are (and there are many) I see more, and more serious, faults in other religious establishments.

Paul exhorted the church at Corinth to, "Examine *yourselves* whether ye be in the faith; prove your *own selves. Know* ye not *your* own *selves,* how that Jesus Christ is *in you,* except ye be reprobates?". (2 Cor. 13:5 *emphasis mine).* This exhortation is appropriate for all people in every age. Each of us as an individual, and all of us collectively as a brotherhood, must re-examine our beliefs, practices, Biblical interpretations, and our attitudes toward those in other "sheepfolds". Self-criticism may easily develop into a masochistic exercise that is less gratifying than our perpetual sadistic analysis of our religious neighbors, but in the long run it will be more profitable to us, and to them. My lifelong association with the Church of Christ has imbued me with a loyalty and preference that I could never shake even if I so desired. Nevertheless, my supreme loyalty to Christ and to truth, as God gives me light to see truth, compel me to reexamine, continuously, my own self and the brotherhood of my special preference. If we are properly and adequately self-critical, correcting ourselves with honest objectivity, we shall get along much better among ourselves, with our "erring" neighbors, and with God.

One of the more precious talents which God gave to each of us is the capacity to think, to reason. Yet, this talent is one that we bury. We are lazy. It is so much easier and more gratifying to buy thinking already canned for us, especially if it is labeled “TRUTH” and if one of our “sound” brethren assures us that it is not adulterated.

I am certain that God saw fit to bless many, perhaps most, other people with capabilities far greater than he gave to me, but I accept this comparative “discrimination” gracefully. This would be a poor world indeed if my capacities and achievements were representative of the best. My responsibility and my desire is to use well the talent entrusted to me and return to my Donor, some day, the principal with added interest. A related responsibility is to do all that I reasonably can do to stimulate other people to use their talent to think. I wish to do that with the least possible offense. God’s children now bleed so profusely from wounds inflicted upon each other that love’s salve can never completely heal.

From my earliest clear recollections as a child to the present moment I have been disturbed by the tragic poverty of serious, honest, objective thinking on my own part and especially, of course, on the part of others. (It has always been easier and more pleas ant to see the speck in my brother’s eye than to detect the log which obstructs my own vision). It bothers me to hear intelligent but lazy, undisciplined minds, “solve” the most complex social, economic, political and international problems, or answer, with an air of self-confident authority, the most profound questions relative to our spiritual destiny, by simple platitudes and cliches drawn from their little bag of folklore, preachments, and traditions, and transmitted by the “sages” of their own small world of groups and subcultures. All of us suffer occasional lapses in thoughtful, objective analysis of situations which face us, and many of us seem never to have begun to think. We are content to be record players, parrots, repeating the meaningless old shibboleths and faulty Biblical interpretations which we have heard repeated in monologue for so long that we accept them as “sound doctrine” that we must defend without critical examination. We suspect the faithfulness of anyone who fails to “ . . . speak the same thing . . .” (1 Cor. 1:10)

Rational thinking is the most difficult of all labor. Perhaps that is one reason we do so little of it. Thinking involves seeing relationships. It requires painstaking analysis of all recognizable factors relevant to the situation or problem under consideration. Seldom, if ever, can we be certain that we have identified *all* of the relevant factors. However, the thinking person has a mind that is aware of its own limitation, open always to consideration of new evidence, and with new insights he will, inevitably, modify his ideas, concepts and beliefs. This willingness to change one’s views consistent with intelligent observation and reason brings upon the thinking person criticism by those whose minds are closed, who “have the truth” and who equate faithfulness with a stubborn, tenacious retention of irrational views.

Honest thinking is anchored in the assumption that our dominant value is truth even if truth does reveal unpleasant factors. If we love truth we must break down the protective walls of prejudice which we have built up around ourselves.

Thinking requires an unusual kind of mental-spiritual honesty, integrity, and objectivity. Courage and integrity are essential if I take into account in my thinking items of evidence which shatter my preconceptions or prove me to be wrong. But if truth is my first love I must be willing to lose my "face". Jesus may have meant this, in part, when he said, " . . . whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's the same shall save it." (Mk. 8:35)

Finally, thinking necessitates a generous measure of genuine humility. Conceit convinces me that I now have the truth and my views are correct. Humility reminds me that I am fallible, and that it is by grace that I am what I am. My present views are, at best, very fragmentary, incomplete and must be tentative. There is no room for felt superiority; no time for bitter attacks against those who differ with me.

I do not accept as true everything that is labeled "science". We have enough idolatry already without deifying another human creation. I do believe, however, that the *method* of science, in so far as it is applicable, is the most useful one yet discovered for revealing reality in the areas of human interpersonal and intergroup relations, and in the area of religious thought. There are, of course, some questions in my own religious perspective which seem to defy satisfactory explanation by the method of science, or by cold logic and rational thinking. The "leap of faith" and "If a man dies, shall he live again?" are examples. I do not presume that I can "prove" my faith or my belief in eternal life by scientific method or by any system of logic. I can, however, reduce some of the irrational elements in my beliefs. Then, some things in this life may be neither rational nor irrational; They may belong in the realm of the nonrational or super-rational. When "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16), the symbols of meaning and communication defy the observation and analysis by human sense perception.

There is an array of forces which frustrates anyone who tries to free his mind from prison and do a bit of thinking. Some of these forces are unintentional; others are deliberately planned. "Dissent" is a nasty word in some circles. Divergence from the norms of thinking of a party or establishment is, to put it mildly, discouraged. A thinking person constitutes a threat to those in authority, or to those who feel burdened with the enormous responsibility of defending "the truth" against "liberalism", "modernism", "evolution", "God is dead", "situation ethics", "ecumenicity" and a host of other evils as they see them. The mouths and pens of heretics and false teachers must be stopped, even if —the most questionable tactics of "modernism" have to be employed to get the job done.

Censorship and censureship are related techniques. The editors of some leading religious papers refuse to publish articles which express points of view contrary to those that prevail in their particular party or sect. There is only one way in which dissenting ideas find their way into a paper that exercises that kind of censorship. A “loyal, sound” writer may include *in* his articles ideas gleaned from a free press provided he censures them uses them as awful examples of “false teaching” which threaten the brotherhood. Often, the writer does not understand the implications of the position which he attacks, but all of those who belong to that party feel relieved that “truth” has been defended against “error”. The result of this kind of editorial policy is a perpetual flow of utter nonsense. When you read one issue, you will have read most future issues for years in advance. It is unfortunate that many in our brotherhood read this kind of paper exclusively, and that in some instances church elders abet the practice by using the “Lord’s money” to order mass subscriptions for a congregation. This helps to keep the membership in a state of spiritual infancy.

I shall mention only one more of the many situations which discourage thinking and honest search for reality and spiritual growth. I refer to the broad area of teaching and education. Much of our “teaching” is not teaching at all in a legitimate definition of the term. And what passes for “education” would best be labeled indoctrination, propaganda, and a process of thought control. Real education is a process of leading out and drawing out latent capacities, of stimulating minds to think and reason and make independent decisions. The “pouring in” process, which in the most common method used, leaves the mental capacities unused until they atrophy. Some pouring in is inevitable especially with young children, but its emphasis should decline with increasing age. It should play a minor role in the education of youth and adults.

The pouring in method is used in the home, and is continued, sometimes with intensified zeal, in church, schools and colleges. (Both the “atheistic and “Christian”) . We force-feed children and youth with so-called knowledge, truth, and wisdom, and all of the “right” answers. We test their ability to play the records back to us perfectly. We shield them, by isolation and segregation, from “false” teachers and doctrine both secular and religious. Thereby, we believe that we are bringing them up “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord”. Our misplaced faith is further reinforced by Solomon’s advice: “Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it”. (Prov.22:6)

We certainly do *train* our children and youth very much as we train dogs and ponies and other animals that lack the mental qualities which God gave to our children. We assume that the “*it*”, from which the child will not depart if he is *trained* properly, must refer to the beliefs, knowledge, and answers with which we filled him. If the record he plays back is exactly in harmony with the recording we made—if he has learned to “speak

the same thing" , then our training must be flawless. I doubt if we interpret Solomon correctly. What do you think?

What are the consequences of our religious education? A considerable segment of our young people, perhaps a majority, do remain "faithful", *more or less,* to the sect in which they have been *trained.* By the time they finish high school their ability to think and to exercise independent judgment has been emasculated or driven underground. Some of these "loyal" youth whom we succeeded in remolding after our own image, excel their parents and teachers in zealous loyalty to their party and in hostility toward all others. They may be poorly equipped to think and to adjust to a changing world, but if they can escape from the real world, perhaps they don't need to think.

A minority of our young people do leave the "*it*". For various reasons, the castration process which succeeds so effectively in making mental and spiritual eunuchs out of the majority, fails with a minority. After they leave the womb of conformity and uniformity imposed by home and/or church, they "go gay", as our Amish friends have learned. Some of our youth react with a radical, violent, revolutionary spirit that shocks us. They have boiled for years in secret resentment of the enslavement to which they have been subjected. When they come "of age" they reject everything associated with early life. We would do well to listen to youth more than we talk, learn how they really think, try to understand, and respect the right of every human mind to be free under God, Creator of all.

Let me make it clear that I am not faultless in the area of education. No one is immune. All of us are under a cloud. The only unpardonable mistake is the stubborn, conceited, proud spirit that refuses to admit error and repent the same. My entire adult life has been devoted to teaching, or trying to teach—trying to rear three children; leading university students in a study of human associative life through a system of thought called sociology; leading church groups in a search for meaning through studying the Bible. I have recognized some of my errors and have tried to correct them. I have been accused of the same "crime" which Socrates and Jesus committed. If that were true it would be the greatest compliment I could want in this world. I don't think that anyone can justly accuse me of closing any mind or hindering the freedom to think and express ideas contrary to my own.

Jesus was a thinker. He challenged his students (disciples) to think. I am one of his disciples—that and no more. He expects me to think, to use the dab of intelligence which he gave me. How can anyone say honestly that he is a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ (much less boast that he is one of the only Christians) until he has emptied himself of his own will, accepted His will, tried to think as He thinks, and walked in the light as He is in the light?

How can any thoughtful person be exposed to the good news and read the dialogues between Jesus and the Pharisees and still fail to see the parallel in our human situation today. Many of us are like the scribes, Pharisees, and "doctors of the law". We are fearful of, and hostile toward, a fresh idea, or an old idea expressed in words that are unfamiliar to us. Dissent, no matter how sincerely and humbly offered, is "false, dangerous".

Jesus was a dissenter. He challenged the interpretations and applications of the law as practiced in that day. He was "liberal", the greatest of all the ages. He invented "situation ethics", was the first "civil rights leader", lead at least one "violent" invasion of religious places, was a severe critic of "private enterprise", championed the rights of women and "minorities" including so-called "races". For these and other things he was hated, villified, hounded all the days of his life on earth, persecuted and finally physically crucified. His disciples, from the first century until the end of the age, may expect similar treatment, and some of this persecution will come from those who *claim* to be followers of Christ. Jesus so warned us, and so it has been. There is a price to pay, crosses to bear, crucifixions to suffer, if we would see Jesus and really walk with Him.

Cloyd Anthony, Ph.D., is now retired after a lifetime of teaching Sociology in Indiana universities.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

"The Lord's Supper" . . .

BANNED IN AUSTIN

By Dick Smith

Normally a book review is designed to give you some basis on which to decide whether or not to acquire it. This review is about a book which the publisher has not only removed from circulation but has destroyed the balance in stock. Our purpose here is to seek to determine what there is about this little volume to merit such spirited suppression.

One of thirty odd titles in the LIVING WORD quarterly series published by the R. B. Sweet Co., "The Lord's Supper" is a 94 page book of 13 lessons authored by Warren Lewis. The series of which it is a part is made up of impressive quarterlies done by capable authors. The one under consideration was obviously approved by the editors, published, distributed and offered for sale. Later it was withdrawn and the balance of books on hand were literally destroyed. We may never know the details of the public or hierarchal pressure which brought this about, and it really doesn't matter. What lies within its pages

to cause the publisher to first print and then repent? What evil are we being spared or what gems are we being denied?

Billed on the cover as “A Mature Study for Adults” the studies look innocent enough at first glance. Following the title of each lesson the “Aim” or learning objective is concisely stated. Each lesson is structured around this aim. Daily Bible readings geared to the content are given. Under the boldface subheadings the material is nicely arranged in readable paragraphs. In most lessons Bible references are profusely sprinkled throughout the text. Following the content are ten study questions. Here we see a deviation from the norm. These are not easy questions and the answers to most of them will *not* be readily found in the text. Of the 130 questions in the book not *one* supplies you with a chapter and verse which will neatly give you the answer. Many of these questions begin with such words as “characterize,” “describe”, “elaborate”, or “What is the relationship between. . .” The questions alone are enough to make an educator stand up and cheer. These mind stretching interrogatives are in great contrast to the more typical “tiger-trap” questions where you fall upon the answer through a baited fragile structure without any effort.

Perhaps the first “offense” which Lewis commits is to force you to think. The text is not authoritative or dogmatic. The tone is predominantly that of probing, seeking, questioning and suggesting. This is a refreshing change from the all too common quarterly which is dogmatically simplistic in providing all the answers. This is not to say that Lewis does not set forth a viewpoint. He does so with certainty. Its his manner of doing so that is quite different.

Though the selected bibliography given at the end cites forty-one recommended works, *not one* of them is recognizable to this writer as a Church of Christ author. Nor could be find a single quote in the entire book from “Restoration Movement” writers. In contrast one finds quotes from Calvin, Zwingli, Luther, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. In this regard the book is utterly devoid of any denominational taint. References are given and works are cited for their excellence and not for their sectarian origin. Again the educator would applaud. Intellectual inbreeding produces few new insights and opens no broad horizons of understanding. As in the biological realm it soon results in abnormalities, weaknesses and defects.

Surely we have seen nothing thus far to justify banning or burning the book. Scattered throughout the lessons are a few things which might appear rather unorthodox but not serious enough to do more than raise a few hierarchal eyebrows. He flatly defines “fruit of the vine” as a “long way to say wine.” Those of us who have used the old “meat and potatoes” illustration with reference to what should clearly be omitted from the Lord’s Table due to the silence of the scriptures might become a bit uncomfortable at Lewis’ recommendation of the *agape,* the Love Feast, coupled with the Lord’s Supper. He further

states that Acts 2:42 & 46 are "particularly suggestive" of daily observance of the Lord's Supper with a larger meal.

More offensive to some, perhaps, is the stated objective of lesson 12: "Jesus Christ has given us the Lord's Supper, how we observe it is up to us." To some this may be the ultimate in liberalism, to presume that the Lord would have left *anything* of this nature up to us. To suggest, verily to even *propose,* that there is liberty in such a matter as the observance of the Lord's Supper is quite a threat to the security of those whose religious "claim to fame" has been based on having the pattern, doing everything "just like the Bible says.'

The author further compounds the problem by urging what he calls "decent experimentation" to improve our observance of the Supper. To make such a suggestion, of course, is to infer that there *is* room for improvement, that what we are presently doing may not be perfect, adequate or fully appropriate. This concept could scarcely be expected to *sit* well *with* those of us who believe we "have all the truth" and have so long been convinced of the great efficacy of our very correctness in the observance of the so-called *"items* of worship." When you stop to think of how much we don't know of how it was originally observed we have a tremendous latitude for our manner of partaking of this sacred feast. If the first participants reclined as they ate with the Lord, and we feel free to sit instead, we could surely stand or kneel while eating together. Tradition has us pass a plate around to share the bread. We *could* pass by the table and serve ourselves. What if women and girls were employed to distribute the supper to the participants, just as they would in a home? Custom says, "Unthinkable!" The silence of the Word would seem to say, "Certainly. Why not?" Like the Roman Catholic who finds security in the familiar Latin sounds of his liturgy, we tend to take comfort in the familiar sight of a table at the front of the room with two men standing behind it and flanked on either side by six or eight male assistants standing in a neat row. Our familiarity with the modern polished aluminum tray filled with 40 little cups might cause us to be totally unnerved to see it replaced one Sunday by a *single* chalice. I would venture to say that some of us would probably get up and walk out. "Decent experimentation" indeed!

As stated earlier, perhaps one of Lewis' cardinal crimes is the failure to give enough answers. He sometimes just leaves you hanging there without a clearly defined "position." After examining briefly the doctrine of transubstantiation and other related *viewpoints Lewis* opines that "The Roman Catholics and Lutherans are probably right in believing that there is 'miracle' here . . . " He agrees with what he calls the truth in these positions and urges that we "move forward to the New Testament and adopt its emphases and definitions." While this is a very "sound" and acceptable statement, it does leave something to be desired by the individual accustomed to neat solutions and pat answers. The worst offense to some may be that Lewis not only fails to refute these ideas of Luther, Zwingli

and Calvin, but that he infers that much of what they say may be true! Without taking a swipe at anybody he calmly wheels his basket through the supermarket of theology and picks up this and that because it looks spiritually edible and nourishing with no regard to the brand name on the label. There's the rub. There is not a negative note in the entire book. That is pretty incriminating in itself.

In the lesson entitled "My Blood" he probes the deep meaning of communion, *koininia*, with the blood of Christ and finally concludes that this "is a very great mystery, but it is so." No neat explanation. He tenderly embraces the mystery of it and accepts it as such. This, of course, is just not done in our circles. One doesn't stand in total awe of biblical concepts. One dissects them and neatly explains each step with chapter and verse. In performing this trick Lewis is a miserable failure.

The lessons dealing with the "Covenant Meal" and the "Messianic Banquet" are elegantly biblical. These in-depth studies of the types, shadows and analogies make these into refreshing and exciting lessons. The Old Testament background of the Lord's Supper beyond the Passover is brought to bear on the subject in a meaningful and effective manner. As elsewhere it becomes clear in these lessons that our author is no superficial scholar.

Possibly the biggest stumbling block of all is the manner in which the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is woven into the very fabric of the entire book. In only two of the thirteen lessons are there no references to the Holy Spirit. "The Holy Spirit is the Lord Jesus Christ returned to his disciples to empower and strengthen them beyond their capacities as mere men." In Lewis' eyes the Lord's Supper represents a moment when the communion of a man with the Master reaches a pinnacle. "Jesus is present to his church in the Lord's Supper." A whole lesson is devoted to this concept and in this writer's opinion is the high point in this worthy little book. The old worn picture of the Lord's Supper as a mere memorial in the sense of a sturdy headstone in a theological graveyard is utterly obliterated. Instead it is set forth as a powerful and deeply meaningful confrontation with the Living Christ. Far more than a memorial symbol to Lewis it is "part of that which it effects . . . it is a channel of blessing, grace and the Holy Spirit."

In lesson 13, "A Theology of the Lord's Supper," Lewis gets down to cases in setting forth some of his ideas regarding the Holy Spirit:

> "The Holy Spirit is the divine power and affluence of God which made the human Jesus to be the divine Christ, which made the human apostles become the spokesmen of divine things, which makes the human Christians to partake of the divine nature, and which makes the created bread and wine to become bearers of the uncreated divine Spirit of Jesus Christ. When the Church eats of the spiritual bread of heaven and drinks of the

> "spiritual rock" they are being nourished by Jesus Christ through his Spirit in the Lord's Supper."

Suppose Lewis is wrong in some of his understandings. Does everything *have* to be "right" in order for us to publish and use a book? Must we approve of all of a man's viewpoints before we can sort out and accept any of them? Is it not spiritually stifling to insist that such publications be so perfect as to speak "ex cathedra" before that can be approved for use? Is it because we tend to look upon "our" publications as the last word, just about as authoritative as the Bible itself? Need we be so coddled and have such a fear of being "led astray" by someone who may differ from us? Is it not actually a very hierarchal point of view to feel that people cannot be trusted to evaluate and think for themselves?

Do we have any indication that the first century congregations were all alike in every custom and procedure? Is this to be desired? Does a total commitment to Jesus as Lord really produce any kind of pattern or ritual? Surely none will argue that the pattern of a prayer, three songs, another prayer and a sermon is based on Holy Writ.

When should a book be banned if ever? I, for one, would refuse to publish a book that had nothing new to say, that failed to challenge my thoughts. I would ban all books which did nothing but reassure me how "right" I was already. I would ban the books in which the authors pretended to give all the answers. Such theological security blankets would have little place on my shelf. Instead I would seek out such books as this stimulating little volume by Warren Lewis which glorify God in Jesus Christ, set forth the Lord's Supper as a glorious uplifting experience in which we are brought nearer the presence of the Savior and are made to stand in awe of his boundless love.

Dick Smith, onetime a missionary to Germany for Churches of Christ, is director of instructional media for Dallas County Junior College System. His address is 1420 Drury Dr., Dallas.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

The Lord's Supper

You will want to read in this issue "Banned in Austin," by Dick Smith, which tells about Warren Lewis' little volume on *The Lord's Supper.* Dick has done a masterful job, but there is no substitute for reading the book. It now looks as if we can at last supply this book. A brother wrote us from Austin that he rescued 200 or so of these books from the several thousands that were destroyed, and he is letting us have them. So, we shall once

more offer the book for sale at 1.00. The last time our supply vanished in the first mail or so. This time we may be able to satisfy the demand. It strikes us as so very strange that all this would happen to a little book about something so peaceful as the Lord's Supper. I wonder what Warren Lewis, now studying in Germany, thinks about it all. He goes to all that trouble and does all that research, and then has the satisfaction of seeing his work in print, only to have the publisher take *it* off the market and destroy it! I still say that things like that can only happen among us. We are God's *peculiar people*, you know!

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

READERS' EXCHANGE

Locating Leroy

Everyone knows, of course, that Brother Garrett is an extremist . . . He is not widely known as a man who exercises great restraint either in what he says or how he says it . . . He is "far out in left field", to be sure.—*Editorial in Gospel Guardian*

In the night's late and lonely hours, when you are alone with your conscience and your God, do such statements, that you are disposed to make, never disturb you? . . . The simple truth is, Brother Garrett, you have forsaken the faith. Why not have the candor and honesty simply to say so, and then, if you wish, try to convince those of us who cling to the "Old Paths" that we are in error.—*Tennessee*

I am wondering where you will go next!—*Oklahoma*

The first two excerpts come from a fellow editor and a veteran evangelist respectively. I am pleased to read these comments, for it reveals that they still recognize me as their brother, and so I presume they love me as such. The *Guardian* editor even sees me as yet in the ball park, and not out in the bleachers, if, albeit, "far out in left field." So, I am still in the game and on the same team. That is all I can ask. Never mind about where you put me on the field! Left field suits me just fine. That's a good place to be if one is interested in those who hit a long ball!

I will gladly confess to "forsaking the faith" as defined by some of my brethren. As defined by still others I was never in the faith, nor was the Tennessee evangelist. I will lay claim to "the faith" as centered in the Person of Him who died for us all; but if in terms of each man's demand that his opinions be made conditions of fellowship, I would not make it. It is just as well if we let God judge in these matters.

The brother in Oklahoma is being friendly. He means, I think, that he's having fun trying to keep up with what's going on.—*Ed.*

A Strange Happening

One of the strangest things happened to her. She married a young preacher who also was a graduate of Freed-Hardeman and he became a very able young preacher. Then he went to California, got a job teaching in a Methodist College and joined the Methodist Church, along with his wife, and all their children are Methodists. The boys' father was a devout Christian and elder of the church and both he and Bettie were brought up to *know the truth*.—*Texas*

This is from a veteran Church of Christ minister, now aged and retired. He is answering my question as to the whereabouts of his niece, with whom I attended Freed-Hardeman 30 years ago. This is hard for most of us to take: one of our ministers, trained at one of our citadels of truth and reared in a family of preachers, to walk out on us and join the Methodists. Horrors! Was he mentally ill? Perhaps it was his wife's fault! How can young people "brought up to *know the truth*" do a thing like that? Suppose they told their story, what would they say?

While I don't believe in doing such awful things as running off to the Methodists, I have to realize that they just might be better off where they are than with us. Maybe they were discouraged by legalism and disillusioned by church fusses. Perhaps they have now found peace and still cling to the important truths taught them while with us.

At least we must allow that one is not necessarily demented or degenerate or even indifferent to spiritual values, when he walks out on us. It might even be for conscious sake that he does it. Too, going to the Methodists might not be quite the same thing as going to hell.

You will notice that *both* of these people were graduates of Freed-Hardeman College. Well, what do you know about that!

More on Tongues

I speak in tongues to praise my Lord and God in private. There has been a mighty change in my ministry since the time a few years back I acknowledged the full ministry of the Holy Spirit in the life of any committed and obedient person in Christ. And I don't mean just the ministry of the tongues.

What I really mean is that we need to realize that the Holy Spirit is the living person of Christ in our lives. He is ready to bless us with any gift that will glorify the Christ and build the body of Christ.—*California*

I am afraid we have another sect coming up in the Church, and we do not need another one, for we already have too many . . . I agree that the gift of love, bequeathed by the Holy Spirit, is the only means whereby we can bind up the fractured brotherhood. Col. 3:14.—*W. Virginia*

I am interested in and wary of the Spirit, and the seekers for same. So I thought your article about the underground church most timely, and as it always true of you, utterly practical. The Spirit, so it seems to me, is best "found" by not seeking his gifts too directly. —*Nashville*

The first excerpt is from a Church of Christ preacher, who tells us that he speaks in tongues in private and that this has worked a mighty change in his ministry. How could this be alarming to any of us? When one views all the carnage in our recent brotherhood history, we should rejoice when a man can have an experience that brings him peace, joy and love and away from our divisive ways. He is also close to Paul's position, who chose to use his gift of tongues in private devotion rather than in public.

The other two expressions are typical of many we have received, and they too need to be heard. Scepticism is healthful too, but it should be tempered by the gifts of the Spirit, especially patience.—*Ed.*

More of This!

Pat Boone will be singing and tcstifying in a David Wilkerson youth rally at the Anaheim Convention Center within the next few weeks . . . A few from the Church of Christ are participating in the forthcoming Billy Graham Crusade in Southern California, including myself.—*California*

You might he interested in a recent development here in Oregon. . . . . has been associating with one of the preachers from the instrumental music groups. They are both interested in the unity of restoration segments of the Lord's body. Each Tuesday morning they are having a prayer session and discussion for purposes of better understanding, and perhaps for laying groundwork for positive action toward unity.—*Oregon*

This is happening more and more all across the country, and it is surely the most encouraging development in our changing brotherhood. If fellowship is restored to our fractured ranks, it will have to be at the grassroots level. Let us remember that unity *is* the fruit of the Spirit and not any clever maneuver of ours. We must seek *His* leading. The indwelling Christ will make men one *if* they will but yield to His love.—*Ed.*

But Less of This!

Maurice Lusk and Helen, his wife, severed their relationship with the Christian Church and were restored to the Lord's church. . . —*Firm Foundation*

It is pathetic, as well as downright wrong and unbrotherly, that we are still doing this kind of thing. It is all right, of course, for a brother to cross these sectarian lines we have drawn, from one side to the other, but we are the *most* sectarian when we imply that in coming over to us he is now in the Lord's church, whereas before he was not. The truth is

that brother Lusk has moved from one faction to another, but we presume in the Lord's church all along, even if a divided church. We will move toward ending such faction when we cultivate the love for *all* God's children that will make such reporting so distasteful that it will not occur. Brother Lusk is no more my brother than before, and he is probably no more *right* than before. God hasten the day that we might see that "being right" on things like instrumental music has nothing at all to do with being *in Christ*!—*Ed*.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.*